

# WASHINGTON STATE B A R A S S O C I A T I O N

Board of Governors

Athan P. Papailiou, Governor At-Large

April 10, 2019

William D. Pickett, President  
Washington State Bar Association  
1325 Fourth Ave., Suite 600  
Seattle, WA 98101-2539

## **Re: Notice of Motion to Remove Governors for Conduct that Brings Discredit to the WSBA**

Dear President Pickett:

The mission of the Washington State Bar Association ("WSBA") is to serve the public and the members of the Bar, to ensure the integrity of the legal profession, and to champion justice. As WSBA's governing body, the Board of Governors is charged with upholding this mission. Unfortunately, however, e-mails have recently been made public in a lawsuit against the WSBA, which may suggest that at least three Governors have acted contrary to our mission by trading secret votes. Pay-to-play politics should have no place on our Board, of course. Such conduct would bring discredit to the Bar, and may call into question the integrity of our decision-making. Moreover, the inappropriate rhetoric of another Governor from a recent e-mail blast also evidences conduct unbecoming of service on this Board. See WSBA Bylaws Sections IV.A.4.1, IV.A.2.c, IV.A.4. Swift remedial action is plainly necessary, given the public nature of these issues.

Accordingly, pursuant to WSBA Bylaws Sections IV.A.4.1, I intend to bring a motion at the next regularly scheduled meeting to remove the following individuals from the WSBA Board of Governors:

**Governor Dan'L W. Bridges**

**Governor P.J. Grabicki**

**Governor Paul Swegle**

Please schedule this for action in public session. Although I regret we have come to this point, we must hold ourselves accountable to the members and the public.

Very Truly Yours,



Athan P. Papailiou

cc: Terra Nevitt, Interim Executive Director, WSBA  
WSBA Board of Governors



1 On Feb 18, 2019, at 6:23 PM, PJ Grabicki  
2 <pjg@randalldanskin.com<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com><mailto:pjg@randallda  
nskin.com>> wrote:

3 Dan

4 I have been working with Jean on our efforts, and have consulted with Suzanne, so  
5 as not to trip over any hurdles. I copied Suzanne on this to get under an attorney  
6 client umbrella.

7 Well, there appear to be three hurdles we have to get over before we can finally  
8 address your issue.

9 —Kara's claim has to be settled and behind us. If we do your deal earlier, she will  
10 erupt and not settle. That is, in her view, we embraced you when #he is the aggrieved  
11 party.

12 —The staff needs to be handled first. If we do your deal first, the rebellion will be  
13 off the charts. We will not get to resolution with them, and the publicity will be  
14 something neither you nor the rest of us want.

15 —Paula's deal needs to be finalized. If we don't get that done and she proceeds to  
16 litigation, having done the deal with you, containing admissions, it creates problems  
17 and difficulty.

18 That being said, both Jean and I want to work to resolution of your situation in a  
19 manner acceptable to you. We are both committed to doing that in good faith. Once  
20 the three hurdles above are past us, we can do that.

21 So, I'm not going sideways on you. I still want to solve our issue. So does Jean.

22 I welcome your thoughts, as always. What say you?

23 PJ

24 \* \* \*

25 On Feb 19, 2019, at 8:16 AM, PJ Grabicki  
26 <pjg@randalldanskin.com<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com><mailto:pjg@randallda  
nskin.com>> wrote:

So, does this change our thinking at all? I suspect not, but weigh in.

Sent from my iPad

1           Begin forwarded message:

2           From: Dan Bridges  
3           <dan@mcbdlaw.com<mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com><mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com>>  
4           Date: February 19, 2019 at 7:46:33 AM PST  
5           To: PJ Grabicki  
6           <pjg@randalldanskin.com<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com><mailto:pjg@randallda  
7           nskin.com>>  
8           Cc: Dan BOG  
9           <danbog@mcbdlaw.com<mailto:danbog@mcbdlaw.com><mailto:danbog@mcbdlaw.com>>, "Jean Y. Kang"  
10           <jeankang.wsba.bog@gmail.com<mailto:jeankang.wsba.bog@gmail.com><mailto:je  
11           eankang.wsba.bog@gmail.com>>  
12           Subject: Re: Claims

13           It seems like you are asking me to sign off on Kara's agreement and hope and trust  
14           we work out my situation later. And if we cannot work that out, I'll be left hanging  
15           having waived all my claims as to her. I trust you, Jean, and essentially everyone  
16           (with Only one exception) one-on-one completely. But would you do that if you  
17           were me? I am not inclined to agree to that. we can address all of your concerns  
18           without leaving me twisting in the wind. We need to address Kara's and my  
19           situations simultaneously.

20           But, We can do our agreement separately and confidentially. she need not even  
21           know of it. That addresses your point on Kara. Albeit, I don't buy that she will care  
22           what we do as long as she gets a check. She is not going to refuse a check even if  
23           the resolution said WSBA believes she fibbed.

24           On staff, That also goes for staff. I'm not going to tell them. All this can be  
25           confidential until after you do the staff meeting. That would seem to address  
26           concerns on staff.

27           On the paula thing, I'm not sure I see an entanglement there. She is one of the  
28           ones who retaliated. Also, the facts are the facts. These things happened openly.  
29           Saying it or not saying it does not change what happened.

30           But as a workaround for the paula thing, the "statement" of what happened could  
31           be held until after whatever the date was we put in that paula has to have her  
32           agreement in place. I figured that would be the case anyway.

33           So as bullet points:

34           A confidential agreement to do certain things AFTER the staff meeting, and  
35           AFTER the date we put for the resolution of Paula's agreement, but with a drop dead  
36           date so it does not linger on too long.

1           The agreement would not be shared with Kara's side. So, you may rip up that  
2 draft agreement I created that was trilateral. We would have a separate, much much  
3 shorter one.

4           I think that addresses the concerns? We need simply get this in place and agreed  
5 confidentially and the action is taken later. WSBA gets past the things you mention,  
6 then this piece already agreed goes forward.

7           Db

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Bridges [<mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com>]

Sent: Monday, February 18, 2019 9:11 AM

To: PJ Grabicki <[pjg@randalldanskin.com](mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com)<<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com>><<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com>>>

Subject: WSBA

Hi PJ. I'll be off my email most of today. I'll check in this afternoon

Let's agree to that last draft language and defer email until after you guys meet with staff. That will get at least 8 votes. Maybe 9. I have to recuse so only need 7 as we are down a governor with mikes position open.

The only modifier is we need a drop dead date for the email. I don't think it will be an issue in the end as the staff need to be met with quickly anyway but the email needs to be done timely and not drag on indefinitely. Plus, having a date for that will serve as further impetus to get the staff meeting done.

We should get this done before the meeting tomorrow so it can all be wrapped up.

Completely unrelated, what do you think of Jean, Carla, Brian, and Rajeeve to meet with the court. That's effectively on person. from each class

Thoughts?

Dan Bridges

Sent from mobile phone.

---

From: Dan Bridges

<[dan@mcbdlaw.com](mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com)<<mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com>><<mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com>><<mailto:dan@mcbdlaw.com>>>

Date: February 17, 2019 at 3:09:10 PM PST

To: "P. J. Grabicki"

<[pjg@randalldanskin.com](mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com)<<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com>><<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com>><<mailto:pjg@randalldanskin.com>>>

Subject: Edits

Below is the redline back to you, after your edits. I'm confused, reading your email I thought that was in there as to me. I would not think it controversial to say WSBA is not going to retaliate against Governors? We just passed an anti-retaliation policy.

DB

---

In regard to Dan Bridges, WSBA Treasurer and District 9 Governor, the Board of Governors of the Washington State Bar Association has determined it appropriate to make the following statement.

During his tenure on the Board, Mr. Bridges brought forward governance and management issues as is the duty of every Governor to do. However, the Board acknowledges there has been adverse action taken by some, on behalf of WSBA, against Mr. Bridges for doing so. Without detailing any adverse actions here, the Board acknowledges they took place over time and pledges going forward no Governor will be retaliated against for bringing forward governance and management issues, and that no Governor should have been subject to adverse action or retaliation in response to discharging his or her duties on the Board.

Further, a personnel matter was raised in 2018 that alleged an act by Mr. Bridges which, if true, took place in 2015. The WSBA, through Executive Staff and independent of any influence by the Board of Governors, retained an outside, independent investigator to consider that claim. That independent investigation found no violation of any WSBA Rule, law, nor any conduct by Mr. Bridges meriting any action against him. That independent investigation found that at all times while serving the WSBA, Mr. Bridges as Treasurer and Governor has acted professionally and appropriately.

Sent from my iPad

Happy Friday fellow WSBA Members!

\* \* \*

\* Shenanigans directed toward overturning the Board's proper decision and processes terminating the prior Executive Director continue like the screeching antics of so many flying monkeys.

\* Most recently these include (i) a failing petition to reimpose the former ED on the WSBA and (ii) a baseless lawsuit, Lincoln Beauregard v. WSBA, filed by Steven Fogg of the Corr Cronin law firm - also to reimpose the former ED on the WSBA.

\* These types of anti-democratic, politically-driven efforts are to be expected in the waning days of a ruthless, entrenched, self-serving political machine. Justice and common sense will prevail.

\* WSBA Members should think twice before ever sending any referrals to the Corr Cronin firm given its role in this costly and counterproductive nonsense, which is now wasting the Members' hard earned dues. As a former friend of the firm, I am extremely disappointed.

\* Upcoming Board Meetings:

\* Special Meeting, Monday April 8 @4:00 - <https://www.wsba.org/news-events/events-calendar/2019/04/08/default-calendar/board-of-governors-special-meeting>

\* Regular Meeting, May 16, 17 in Yakima - <https://www.wsba.org/news-events/events-calendar/2019/05/16/default-calendar/board-of-governors-meeting>

Have a great weekend everyone. Go M's!

Paul Swegle  
Governor, Dist. 7N  
Immediate Past Chair, Corporate Counsel Section  
Washington State Bar Association